


Applicant respectfully elects to prosecute Group E of the Group 1 claims, with traverse.

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the above-identified application respectfully requested.

Initially, some of the groups identified by the Examiner make no logical sense to Applicants. For example, claims 1 and 6 have been identified as being different inventions. Initially, it seems illogical to state that a dependent claim is a different invention than the independent claim from which it depends. If the dependency is correct, then how can they be different inventions? This logic applied to its logical extension would give rise to declaring each and every dependent claim as being a different invention than the its independent claim. It is not understood how a different search is required for searching a subset of a set. It is noted further that this distinction (between the subject matter of claims 1 and 6) gives rise to many of the groups structured by the Examiner. Reconsideration of such groups, then, respectfully is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jerry K. Mueller, Jr.  
Reg. No. 27,576  
MUELLER AND SMITH, L.P.A.  
MUELLER-SMITH BUILDING  
7700 Rivers Edge Drive  
Columbus, Ohio 43235-1355  
Tel.: 614-436-0600  
Fax: 614-436-0057  
email: smueller@muellersmith.com

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited on March 13, 2002, with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Box NON-FEE AMENDMENT  
Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231



Jane Keeney